3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

frequently translated into many European languages.[1] The poet who perhaps most enriched the Jagatai literature was Mir Ali Shir Navaï, who lived during the Timurid dynasty.

It is interesting to note that among the latest documents in the older form of the Uigur written character are some letters sent by the Mongol Khans of Persia in the thirteenth century to the Pope of Rome, Philip-le-Bel King of France, and Edward I King of England, the object of which was to arrange an offensive alliance against the Saracens. There were as many as six Embassies exchanged. A number of the letters were written in Uigur with Latin translations, and the original Uigur manuscripts of some of these were found by M. Abel Rémusat in Paris.[2] It is possible that the

[1] The translations in English are as follows:

'Memoirs of Zehir-ed-Din Muhammed Baber, Emperor of Hindustan, written by himself, in the Jaghatai Turkic, and translated partly by the late John Leyden, partly by William Erskine', London, 1826.

'The Memoirs of Bābur; a new translation of the Bābur-nāma, incorporating Leyden and Erskine's of 1826 A.D.', by Annette S. Beveridge, London, 1912.

'Memoirs of Baber, Emperor of India, First of the Great Moghuls, being an abridgement with an introduction, supplementary notes, and some account of his successors', by Lieut.-Col. F. G. Talbot, London, 1909.

[2] Abel Rémusat, 'Mémoires sur les relations politiques des princes chrétiens et particulièrement des rois de France avec les empereurs mongols', *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscr. et Belles-Lettres*, Pt. I, vol. vi, pp. 396–469; Pt. II, vol. vii, pp. 335–431. See also T. Hudson Turner, 'Unpublished Notices of the Times of Edward I and of his Relations with the Moghul Sovereign of Persia', *Arch. Jour.*, VIII, London, 1851, pp. 47–50; I. J. Schmidt, *Philologisch-kritische Zugabe zu den von H. Abel Rémusat bekannt gemachten in den königlich-französischen Archiven befindlichen zwei mongolischen Original-Briefen der Könige von Persien Argun und Oeldshaitu an Philipp den Schönen*, St. Petersburg, 1824.

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

originals of those sent to England may yet be found in some British collection. Some of the envoys were Uigur priests of Nestorian religion.[1]

Religion.

Among the Iranian Turks in Turkestan the almost universal religion is Mahometanism. Its adherents form 99 per cent. of the Turks in Ferghana (Kokand), 93 per cent. in Samarkand, 96 per cent. in Syr Daria, and 88 per cent. in Transcaspia (1897). They are mostly Sunnites, and of the Hanifite rite. It is recognized in the Mahometan world that nowhere else is there such strict adherence to the Koran and the Sunna as in this region, nowhere else are there so many religious orders and so many saints. This contemporary religious fanaticism, however, does not play the cultural rôle which it did when Mahometanism was introduced into this region in the tenth and eleventh centuries, as a rival to the earlier influences of Buddhism, Christianity, and the well-developed local animistic religion. At that time, under the influence of Iranian culture, Mahometanism meant also the development of science and art, literature and architecture. The present theologians of Turkestan have banished from their religion everything which is not in accordance with strict devotion and

[1] The Uigur manuscripts known to exist in European libraries are:

Kudatku Bilik (copy made in Herat in 1439) (Wiener Hofbibliothek).

Légende de Oghus Chan (Library of Charles Schefer of Paris).

Teskere-i-ewlija (Bibliothèque Nationale).

Miradj nameh (Berliner Bibliothek).

Yarlyk of Temir Kutlug (Wiener Hofbibliothek).

Yarlyk of Toktamysh (Moscow Library).

Application of the envoy of Chami, Babeke, to the Chinese Emperor, with Chinese translation (Asiatic Museum, Petrograd).

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

101 south later on. But its distribution is still wider: the
174 eastern neighbours of the Uriankhai, the *Darkat* and the *Uigur*, living on the shores of Lake Kossogol, have a clan called Tuba, though no tribe here uses this name for itself as a whole. The Darkat now speak a Mongolian language, but in tradition they seem to have more in common with the Turks than with the Mongols.

The *Tuba* is not the only clan-name so widely spread; there are others, such as Kirghis, Sokka, Oirat Ari, &c., while some clan-names, such as Kaska among the
● 175 Kachints, are peculiar to one tribe. On the whole, the Siberian Tatars cannot be compared to the Kaizak with regard to their memory of the tribal and clan past. Katanoff[1] found that this lack of tradition seems to characterize all the Turks known as 'Tatars'. 'The Kazan Tatars do not have any written or oral record relating to the important fact of the fall of Kazan, under the pressure of Ivan the Terrible, and the Tobolsk Tatars scarcely have any records giving accounts of the Tsar Kuchum and his wars with the Russians. But perhaps the fault rests more with Kuchum's personality, for it is not so much the events which are important in history as the personality of heroes that inspire the oral tradition. Thus a certain hero Kangza, unknown in history, has very many tales devoted to him among the Teleut (Radloff), the Altaians (Vyerbitski), and the Abakan Tatars (Katanoff).

101 Of all the Siberian Tatars the most interesting ethnologically are the *Chern* (in Russian) or *Black Forest 'Tatars'*, also known as *Altaians*, though the name Altaians is wider and includes also some other Tatars, such as the Kumandints. The Altaians call themselves

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 267.

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

draught purposes carried on together, and in a way it characterizes the Uriankhai, for they seem to combine the traits of the Mongol horse-nomads, the Turkic hunters and cattle-breeders, and the Tungus reindeer-breeders. 233

History.

The history of the Turks in Central Asia falls roughly into the following periods: 175

I. From the first vague mention of them in the Chinese annals of the Tang and Yu dynasties (2356-2200 B.C.), and the no less vague mention in the *Avesta* (if it is right to identify 'Tura' with Turks), to the middle of the sixth century A.D., when the name Tu-kiu (Turks) appears for the first time.

II. From the rise of the Tu-kiu, through the period of rapid independent development, to the Mongolian invasion in the thirteenth century.

III. From the thirteenth century through the period of the great migrations started by the Jinghis Khan conquests, and of the still independent Turkic states under Mongolian dynasties, to the beginning of the Russian advance in the seventeenth century.

IV. From the seventeenth century, through the period of the wars with Russia and of subsequent Russian rule, to the Russian Revolution of 1917.

First Period. The probable ancestors of the Turks lived to the north of China, and were mentioned by the Chinese chroniclers as long ago as the third millennium B.C. on account of their raids on China, but of course scarcely any mention is made by the Chinese of the Turks living to the far north and far west of China.

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

175 [101] The first name now identified as that of the ancestors of the Turks is *Hiung-nu*. According to Professor Parker,[1] there exists 'a Hiung-nu tradition that about 1200 B.C. a (Chinese) royal personage who had most probably been misconducting himself fled to the nomads of the north and founded among them a sort of dynasty'. The Chinese are concerned with their neighbours on the north-west, the Hiung-nu, and on the north-east, the *Tung-hu* (subsequently Tungus), only so far as these barbarians annoyed them. The Emperors of the Tsin dynasty (255–209 B.C.) built the Great Wall to protect their northern frontiers, and this directed the strategic movements of the Hiung-nu in the second century B.C. towards the west. It is possible that some branches of them may have migrated westwards before the construction of the Great Wall, and then continued to develop quietly in their new home, otherwise it is hard to understand the high degree of organized culture in which we find them in the Altai and Yenisei region about 200 B.C.,[2] when we hear that the Kirghis and the Usuni were already there, and had found some remnants of still earlier Turkic immigrants. They may possibly have been in possession of this region already in the Bronze Age, unless, of course, we assume the independent origin of the Altai and Yenisei Turks, and take

[1] E. H. Parker, *A Thousand Years of the Tartars*, 1895, p. 3. Another Chinese translator, Father Jakinth Bichurin, gives a different version of the origin of the Hiung-nu dynasty: Shun-wei, son of the last emperor of the Hia dynasty, went in 1764 B.C. to Mongolia, and there started the Hiung-nu dynasty. Bichurin considers the Hiung-nu to be Mongols. (*Collection of Information concerning Peoples living in Central Asia*, 1851, vol. I.)

[2] N. A. Aristoff, *Attempt at an Explanation of the Ethnic Composition*, &c., p. 460.

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

the Hiung-nu as representing a stage when the easternmost Turks were not yet differentiated from the Mongols. 175 •

A more clearly defined stage is that of the Hun-nu Empire (possibly a form derived from Hiung-nu), which united under its domination most of the Turkic tribes of Central Asia. The reign of Mété (209–179 B.C.) seems to mark the climax of their power in Asia. The information gathered from the Chinese annals gives us the geographical distribution of the Turks of that time, who were divided into two hostile groups, Western and Eastern, both subject to Mété. The Eastern Turks were composed of the Uigur, between Tannu Ola and the Yellow River, and between the Tian-Shan and the basin of the Tarim. To the north of them lived the Din-lin (Telengit?), near Tannu Ola. The Kirghis (Khakas) lived along the Yenisei, and the Karluk and Tu-kiu in the Altai, and as far south as Tarbagatai.

The Western Turks comprised the Usun (Úsuni), who lived to the south of Lake Balkash; the Kangli (Kan-giu), farther west as far as Amu Daria; the Yüe-Chi,[1] still farther to the south-west as far as the Caspian Sea; and the Yao-Chi, to the north of the last-named.

The Usun power in the western part of Turan (rivers Ili and Chu) dates chiefly from the end of the second century B.C. to the first century A.D. Since they found on their arrival the Kangli (Kan-giu) Turks settled in the Tian-Shan, it was with them that they struggled for the predominance, and both sides called for help either to the Chinese or to the Hun-nu.[2] But

[1] W. W. Radloff, *Concerning the Uigur*, 1893, p. 126.
[2] Aristoff, *op. cit.*, p. 461.

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

• 175 when both of them were subdued by the Hun-nu, their two tribes intermingled, and a part of them migrated to the northern outskirts of their territory, to escape the despotic rule of their conquerors, the Hun-nu. It is possible to look upon these groups as the earliest Kaizak organization, later imitated by the Cossacks.

All these probably Turkic tribes, and many remnants of 'Aryan' peoples and states in Central Asia, were under the rule of Mété,[1] who divided his empire into twenty-four parts, governed by six princes and six administrators. Within each part a strictly military organization prevailed, with units of 10, 100, 1000, and 10,000 men.

Nineteen of these twenty-four groups were composed of Uigur. Ten of them formed a confederation called On-Uigur, and nine another confederation called Togus-Uigur. The latter lived to the north of the On-Uigur. Professor Radloff thinks that as the bulk of the Hun-nu Empire was composed of On-Uigur, it is possible that the name Hun-nu is only a corrupt form of On-Uigur, On-Ui.[2]

The Chinese feared the power of the Hun-nu so much that about the middle of the second century B.C. they tried to make a defensive alliance with the Yüe-Chi, who, at the end of the pre-Christian era and the beginning of our own, formed one of the most powerful empires of Central Asia. Though that attempt failed, we hear that the Hun-nu, after having defeated the

[101]

[1] Though Professor Radloff reckoned the Yüe-Chi as a Turkic tribe, it is more probable that they were a Tung-hu tribe surrounded by Turkic people, with whom the Chinese confused them. They are later known as Kushan.

[2] Radloff, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

175 •

Wusun (Usuni) near Ili in 176 B.C., and the Yüe-Chi near the Tarim valley, were subsequently conquered by the Yüe-Chi at the end of the first century B.C., and that in the same century a Hun-nu prince submitted to China.[1]

Subsequently the eastern half of the Hun-nu Empire was divided into northern and southern parts, both of which had finally fallen by A.D. 215. The downfall of the Hun-nu Empire was thus due to the combined efforts of the Chinese and the Tung-hu, and indeed a Tung-hu power (Sien-pi, Toba, and Moyun) was then arising between China and the Turks.

It would seem as if the Hun-nu, their power in Asia ruined by all these defeats, migrated westwards in the second and third centuries, particularly the On-Uigur branch of them. Taking these to be the Huns who terrified Europe in the fifth century, we know that in A.D. 275 they were on the Volga, afterwards advancing farther west. At the same time another stream of the Hun-nu directed its course towards Transoxania, where they were known as the White Huns of Ephthalites. From there they successfully advanced on Persia and India, until in A.D. 528 their movement was checked by a confederation of Hindu princes.

Some of the tribes who entered into the composition of the Hun-nu Empire of Mété, and already at that period had a marked individuality, were the Khakas, later called Kirghis, and the Kiao-Che ('High-Carts'), later called Uigur. The Chinese historians say that the Kirghis and the Uigur (both of whom they call sometimes Ting-ling, sometimes Kankalis) use the same

[1] É. Chavannes, *Les Documents chinois découverts par Aurel Stein dans les sables du Turkestan oriental*, Oxford, 1913, p. vii.

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

•175 language, and Professor Parker makes the suggestion that all the cart-using people of Hiung-nu origin north of the desert region of Issyk-Kul and Syr Daria were once called Ting-ling.[1]

How far the other tribes of Central Asia prominent towards the end of the pre-Christian era, for instance the Saka, were related to the Hun-nu it is difficult to ascertain, but in any case the 'Aryan' population of West Central Asia must have been considerably long after the Graeco-Bactrian kingdoms were destroyed by the Yüe-Chi. The lack of information about the linguistic affinities of these people makes it difficult to define them in the very early centuries of our era. It is known, for instance, that the Hun-nu used the Turkic language in the fourth century A. D.,[2] but whether it was their original language is not clear.

[142] We hear that the Usuni (Wusun) of Ili and Balkash, and the Khakas (later Kirghis), were fair-haired and blue-eyed. This may be explained either by their contact with some 'Aryan' people, or by attributing to them an 'Aryan' origin. In 95 B. C. the Chinese said that the Khakas lived in the regions of the Kem and the upper Yenisei. Then again in the third century A. D. we hear about the 'blond Kirghis' (Kien-kun) as being very powerful and providing 20,000 men in time of war.[3] Of course, we have no proof that the fair Khakas of that time, and their kin the Uigur, were Turkic-speaking people, except that some names of objects and of the months mentioned by the Chinese

[1] Parker, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

[2] Barthold, review of Aristoff's *Attempt at an Explanation of the Ethnic Composition*, &c., p. 343.

[3] O. Donner, 'Sur l'origine de l'alphabet turc du Nord de l'Asie', *J. Soc. Fin.-Ougr.*, Helsingfors, 1896, XIV, p. 70.

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

in connexion with the Khakas are in a Turkic language.[1] After the ninth century the Chinese no longer speak of them as Khakas, but as Kili-ki-dze, which, according to Klements, is a Chinese pronunciation of the name Kirghis. The time of the greatest development of the Kirghis belongs to the seventh to ninth centuries, i. e. to the second period of Turkic history.

The Uigur are first heard of about the second century B. C., and the Chinese had constant relations with them from that time till the sixteenth century, so that the history of the Uigur runs through all the first three periods of Turkic history. But as the evolution of this important tribe is an essential part of the history of the Turks in Central Asia it will be useful to give here a consecutive account of them in some detail.

The Uigur were known to the Chinese under the names Hao-Hui, Kao-Che, Kan-Hui, Vei-He, U-He, U-Hu, Hon-He, and Hu. It was through the various Asiatic transliterations of the name Uigur that European writers came across it. The first mention of it is found in Ptolemy.[2] In its present form the name seems first to have been used in the Mahometan histories at the beginning of the thirteenth century.[3] Rashid al-Dīn says that in his time the name Uigur was applied to a large group of Turkic tribes living between the sources of the Yenisei and the Selenga. But after this, in fact until the seventeenth century, most of the Eastern Turks were known under this name.

While most Turkic scholars, such as Rashid al-Dīn,

[1] N. N. Kosmin, *D. A. Klements and Historical and Ethnographical Research in the Minusinsk Country*, Irkutsk, 1916, p. 7.

[2] *Serica*, Liber IV, p. 16, 3.

[3] Skrine and Ross, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

175 Abul Ghazi, Kasem Beg, Vambéry, Klaproth, and 101 Schott, derive the name Uigur from a Turkic root, J. I. Schmidt refers it to the Mongolian language, and places the origin of the Uigur people in Tibet.[1] If we accept Professor Radloff's view that the bulk of the Hun-nu, or rather the southern branch of them, were the On-Uigur, then we know that most of them moved towards the west along the steppes lying north of Tian-Shan. But the people who played their part in the history of Central Asia were those of the On-Uigur who remained behind in Eastern Turkestan, especially in the basin of the Tarim, and the Toqus-Uigur in the northern part of the present Mongolia. That branch of them who were already established near the Aral Sea in the second century A. D. are often called by their neighbours simply *On* or *Onlar* ('Ten').[2] Later, when after the death of Attila the Hunnic Empire broke into separate tribes, they again assumed their tribal names, viz. On-Uigur, Utigur, Sary-Uigur, Kotrigur, while the name Hun almost disappears. Of these tribes, the On-Uigur are known to have been in the north of the Caucasus in the seventh century, on their way back to Asia.[3]

174 It is difficult to follow the exact fate of these remnants of the Hun-nu Empire. Presumably a part of them settled among the Finnic tribes of the steppe forest near the Urals, but there is so far very little proof in support of the somewhat vague assumption that the

[1] *Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der Völker Mittelasiens*, St. Petersburg, 1824, p. 95.

[619] [2] Among the Turks a confederation of tribes very often has as its name the number of the tribes composing it, e.g. Uz, 100, probably the same as Ghuz. Radloff, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

[3] Radloff, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

powerful Finnic state of Ugra, which in the tenth and eleventh centuries stretched between the Volga and the Urals, owes its name to the Uigur. 174

Of the Uigur who stayed in Asia, i.e. the Togus Uigur, we know that in the fifth century they emancipated themselves from the power of the Jwen-Jwen, and created an independent state called by the Chinese Hao-fu. At the time of the hegemony of the Tu-kiu the Uigur also were subdued to them. When in turn the leading rôle among the Turks of Central Asia passed to the Uigur dynasty (A. D. 744–847), the name of the state was again Togus-Uigur ('Nine Tribes'), though it was composed of more than that number of tribes. The capital of the Khagan of the Togus-Uigur was Karakorum on the River Orkhon. Some fourteen Khagans ruled during the period of Uigur power. When, in consequence of the intrigues of the Chinese with the other Turkic tribes, the Uigur dynasty and political power were undermined and finally overthrown at the hands of the Kirghis (A. D. 847), the Uigur culture, which was of a high order, still flourished in Western China, Eastern Turkestan, and the district of Hami. It was in that district that the later Uigur state, under the dynasty of the Arslan Khans, continued its existence, and curiously enough it enjoyed an independent and influential position, since its civilization spread among the nomadic Mongols, and even in Transoxania. This position the Uigur owed solely to their great ability, and to their sedentary agricultural mode of life, which raised them, as it did the Yenisei Kirghis, above their nomadic neighbours. They came under the influence of Buddhism, of Christianity, and later on of Islam. In the western part of the Uigur country 175 ● [177]

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

175 a new political power, that of the Islamic Uigur dynasty of Ilek Khan, arose, and its domination spread as far as Bokhara. But the advance of the Kara-Kidan once more overthrew the power of the Uigur, who were obliged to recognize the suzerainty of the Kara-Kidan. These in their turn succumbed before Jinghis Khan. Yet even in the times of the Mongolic rule of Jinghis Khan the Uigur culture did not fail to make itself felt, and still later it was able to produce the well-known Nestorian patriarchs, Rabban Cauma and Jabalaha.[1]

Second Period. It is not easy to trace the history of any other Turkic tribe with the same continuity. Turning to the Tu-kiu, with whom begins the second period of the history of the Turks in Central Asia, we meet with them first about A. D. 550, at the time when the Sassanides were reigning in Persia, when we find them living, under the name of Assena, between the Altai and the Syr Daria.

101 Professor Parker derives the word Tu-kiu from the Turkic word *durkö*, meaning 'helmet', from the shape of the mountain to which the Turkic tribe of Assena migrated to escape from the despotic rule of the Sien-pi (Tung-hu). They seem, however, not to have been independent even there, since they had to serve the then powerful Jwen-Jwen as workers in iron.[2] They adopted the name of the mountain Durkö as a tribal name.

[1] J. B. Chabot, *Histoire du Patriarche Mar Jabalaha III et du Moine Rabban Cauma*, traduite du Syriaque, 1893, vol. I, p. 578.

[174] [2] The Jwen-Jwen (Zhu-Zhu) are possibly the ancestors of the Avars, who appeared in Europe in the sixth century, and forming a wedge between the Eastern and Western Slavs, soon amalgamated with them. Blochet identifies the name Jwen-Jwen with Ib-Ib, Ibim, Ibil, Ibir, from which he derives Sybir, Siberia, and he believes the Jwen-Jwen to be of Tungus stock, and identical with the Sien-pi ('Le Nom des Turcs dans l'Avesta', *J.R.A.S.*, 1915, p. 305).

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

adopted the name of the mountain Durkŏ as a tribal name.

There seems to be some confusion as to the geographical position of the mountain thus connected with the rise of the Durkŏ, Tu-kiu, or Turks. Professor Parker[1] places it not far from the city of Shan-tan in the modern province of Kan-su, which in the sixth century was called Kin-shan, i. e. 'Golden Mountains'. But the birthplace of the Turks is usually held to be the Altai Mountains, which are also called Kin-shan. Since when we first hear of the Turks they are expert metal-workers, it would seem that the Altai, with its incomparable mineral wealth, is more likely to be the Kin-shan of the Chinese sources. All modern archaeological and ethnological investigations support this view.

At the end of the fifth century the Tu-kiu became very prosperous, probably thanks to their metal industry and the richness of the mountains near which they settled, and in A. D. 530 their prince Tumen (Tumin) threw off the yoke of the Jwen-Jwen and soon subjugated all the Turkic states of Central Asia to himself, adopting the title of Il-Khagan.[2] For a short time—

[1] Parker, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

[2] It would seem that the title Khagan (Khan), usually so closely associated with the Turks, and occurring in the Turkic inscriptions of the Orkhon, is not Turkic, but Tungus. But this hypothesis of Blochet holds good only if it be assumed that the Jwen-Jwen were Tungus, and that Tumen used their title after taking the hegemony in Central Asia from them. The title used by the chiefs of the Huns was Chab-gu, and at the time when the Huns were at the height of their power the chiefs of the Jwen-Jwen Tungus adopted the title Chab-gu, until at the beginning of the fifth century they were strong enough to impose on other people their own title of Khagan, which was taken up by Tuimien in 552 (Blochet, *op. cit.*, p. 305).

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

from the middle of the sixth to the middle of the seventh centuries—the Turks of Central Asia were again united and independent, as at the time of Mété. Soon, however, the eastern part of the empire passed under Chinese domination. Then it again became independent under the Uigur dynasty (A. D. 744–847).

The western part of the Tumen Empire escaped the domination of the Chinese only to fall under Arabian influence, and subsequently under the intellectual supremacy of Iran, during the renaissance of Iranian culture under the dynasty of the Samanides in the tenth century. Thus the splendour of Transoxania at that time was obviously the work of the Persians, not of the Turks, who must be judged rather by the civilization of the Eastern Empires. It was from these Eastern Empires that the main migrations of the Turks of that epoch originated.

From the tenth to the thirteenth centuries the Turks under Karluk[1] and Seljuk advanced into Turkestan, increasing the Turkic population there and destroying the Iranian culture. Some of them pushed on farther towards Asia Minor, while others followed a northern route via the Caspian and Black Sea steppes.

Four main groups of Turkic invaders of Southern Russia can be distinguished between the ninth and the thirteenth centuries: the Pyechenyeg or Kangli, the Khazar (possibly the plural of Khazak, Kaizak), the Uz (Ghuz) or Turki, and the Kuman (Kipchak) or Polovtsy.[2]

[1] A. Vambéry identifies the people of Karluk with the tribe of Naiman, and says that they were Turks (*op. cit.*, p. 15). Cahun would also class the tribe of Naiman, as well as the other Christian tribe, the Kirei, as Turks (*op. cit.*, pp. 208–9), while Skrine and Ross class both Kirei and Naiman as Mongols (*op. cit.*, p. 152).

[2] P. Golubowski, *op. cit.*, p. 56. See p. 46.

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

When the Khazar appeared in Eastern Europe at the end of the ninth century they pushed the Pyechenyeg, who had already been there for about half a century, towards the west. Again, the Pyechenyeg, as they were forced westwards, drove before them, into the Danube region, the Magyars, the Asiatic people who preceded the Pyechenyeg in their westward migration. 175 ●

The Kirghis appear again in this second period. During the supremacy of the Karluk (from the middle of the eighth to the middle of the twelfth centuries) they occupied the country stretching from the Yenisei to the westernmost part of Tian-Shan. Here they developed almost independently of the Karluk. When in the twelfth century the Kara-Kidan extended their power over Tian-Shan, they had great trouble in subjugating the Kirghis.

Third Period. A new era in the history of the Turks begins with the Jinghis Khan invasions at the very beginning of the thirteenth century. It is still a disputed point whether the Jinghis Khan invasions can be called Mongol, or whether they were largely Turkic, but carried out under the military supremacy of a handful of Mongolian steppe nomads. It began, as Professor Parker says, 'in the humblest way, grew as it rolled over the plains like a huge snowball, absorbing almost everything in its way'.[1]

Until then the main struggles of China had been with the two neighbouring races, the Hiung-nu and the Tung-hu, and it is somewhat obscure what position the Mongols occupied towards these races. One thing is certain, however, that culturally the Mongols were the most backward people, since the Tung-hu were

[1] Parker, *op. cit.*, p. 303.

3. Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

175 always influenced by Chinese civilization and the Hiung-nu by Chinese plus Iranian.[1] This will explain why Jinghis Khan himself and all his dynasty were under obligations to Turkic culture. We hear that Jinghis Khan had as preceptor for his sons a Uigur Turk named Tatatungo,[2] and in the religious and cultural toleration he is known to have shown to the conquered countries the preference was given to the Turks. Two Turkic sovereigns contemporary with Jinghis Khan, Ouang Khan ('Prester John') of the Kirei and Tai-Yang-Khan of the Naïman, were devoted Nestorian Christians.

101 Thanks to the researches of Rashid al-Dīn, it is

144 [1] Such would be the view obtained from as independent a standpoint as possible. It must be remembered, however, that Mongolian scholars would be ready to find a much larger Mongol element present in pre-Jinghis Khan times, and would attribute the Jinghis Khan conquests to the genius of the Mongolic race. There are tribes, such as the ancient 'Tatars'—some of them, namely the Otui and Tokus 'Tatars', mentioned in the inscriptions of Bilghe Khan in the Orkhon valley as dependent on Turkic *ela* (confederacy)—whom Mongolian scholars such as Father Jakinth Bichurin would reckon with the Mongols, while the Turkic scholar N. A. Aristoff reckons them with the Turks. And if a Tungus scholar cared to trace the origin of the name Tatar (a subdivision of Tatan) in the Chinese annals as translated by Bichurin, he would find that the name Tatan was adopted in the ninth century by a branch of the Mo-ho (Mokho) who were descendants of Sushen and Ilu, now recognized as being of Tungus race. In the twelfth century the Tatan confederacy was composed of Mongol, Khere, Taigut, and Tatar tribes. Bichurin gives Jinghis Khan as one of the four princes belonging to it. (W. Thomsen, 'On the Orkhon and Yenisei Monuments with Inscriptions', *J. Min. Educ.*, June, 1898; J. Bichurin, *Notes on Mongolia*, vol. II, pt. iii, pp. 174–7; N. A. Aristoff, 'Notes on the Ethnic Composition of the Turkic Tribes and Nations', *L. A. T.*, 1896, III and IV, pp. 277–456.)

[2] Skrine and Ross, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

possible to obtain a clear idea of the tribes inhabiting Central Asia in his time. From his knowledge of them, and the information he collected, he divides them into three groups: (1) the Ogus Turks and their kindred, of purely Turkic blood; (2) the tribes which were taken for Mongols in the thirteenth century, but who were in fact Mongolized Turks; (3) the tribes of purely Mongol blood, who lived on the eastern and northern outskirts of the Turkic lands.[1] Hence the tribes called pure Turks by Rashid al-Dīn probably inhabited the lands which are known to have recovered their Turkic features after the death of Jinghis Khan.

Of the states that arose after the death of Jinghis Khan in 1227 the most Turkic were the Middle Empire (Eastern and Western Turkestan), ruled over by his son Jagatai and his descendants, and Dasht-i-Kipchak, i.e. the country of the lower Volga, the North Caspian Steppes, the Aral Steppes, and Western Siberia, ruled over by another son, Juji, and his descendants.

Turkic in feeling and in culture as were Jagatai and his line, they were succeeded in 1360 by Timur, a chief of Moghulistan, purely Turkic in blood as in sympathies, who founded the brilliant Timurid dynasty.[2] 'The annals of this house were rendered illustrious by the names of poets, philosophers, and theologians which are still household words throughout the East.'[3] Among its famous members was the great general, philosopher, and writer Mirza Baber, whose Memoirs still remain as a monument in the Jagatai language.[4]

[1] Radloff, *Concerning the Uigur*, p. 1.
[2] L. Cahun (*op. cit.*) takes Timur to be a descendant of Jagatai.
[3] Skrine and Ross, *op. cit.*, p. 180.
[4] See p. 27.

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

• 175 The splendour of the Timurids was checked by the advance of the Kaizak-Usbegs at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth centuries. These brought new blood, partly Turanian, partly Mongol, into a region which was becoming Iranized. The Usbegs, who claimed descent from Jinghis Khan through his son Juji, appeared in Transoxania about the time when the Turko-Tatars were losing their dominion over Muscovite Russia, forming, as it were, a returning wave of Turks, whose three hundred years of mastery in Eastern Europe proved a failure, in that they neither entirely subdued their Russian foes, nor entirely assimilated themselves with them.

The history of the Usbegs in Transoxania is the history of three separate Khanates, those of Bokhara, Khiva, and Kokand, for the Usbeg conquerors were never strong enough to form an empire equal to that of the Timurids or of Jinghis Khan, or perhaps had not enough of the spirit of unity and the power of organization so strongly developed among the Timurids to achieve such a task.

The Turks of the Altai and Western Siberia, who had succumbed to the power of Jinghis Khan after but slight resistance, became independent after the fall of the Golden Horde. Their western branch started an independent state along the River Ishim. In the middle of the fourteenth century they divided into two, one with its capital at Chingi-Tura (now Tiumien), and later at Isker (Sybir), and the other along the River Ishim. In the fifteenth century Khan Kuchum moved with his Kaizak from the Aral-Caspian steppes and overran both empires, creating a great Siberian Khanate from the Urals to the left tributaries of the Ob. In 1583

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

175

his capital Isker fell into the hands of the Cossacks under Yermak.

Another Turkic state, which had also become independent after the death of Jinghis Khan, offered more resistance to the Russians than did the Khanate of Kuchum. This was a state of the Kirghis, or rather a confederacy of four states,[1] including among its *kyshtymy* (subjects, slaves) many Finnic and Samoyedic peoples.

Very little is heard of the Kirghis from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century. They appear again in the fifteenth century at the time of the fall of the Jagatai dynasty, when it is recorded that the Kaizak population was enlarged by new additions from the Kangli and Kipchak tribes. In the seventeenth century the Kirghis, emancipated from the rule of the Jagatai, were employing the Kaizak in their fights against the Mongol Kalmuck. It was probably then that the Kirghis and the Kaizak began to intermix, and as the result of this struggle with the Kalmuck part of the Kirghis and the Kaizak migrated to Ferghana.

At the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries the Kirghis state on the Yenisei, though its position was not to be compared with what it was in the most flourishing period from the seventh to the tenth centuries, still carried on the tradition of the old Khakas, and was an agricultural state, highly organized politically, if not strong in a military sense. The first Russians to invade the Kirghis state in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, namely the Cossacks from Tomsk, made a distinction between these Kirghis

[1] The four states were Altir, Altisar, Isar, and Tuba or Tubiu. (N. N. Kosmin, *op. cit.*, pp. 14–21. See also *Historical Documents*, published by the Imperial Archaeological Commission.)

3: Czaplicka ' E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

175 and the Kaizak whom they came across in their conquest of the Kuchum Khanate.[1] It was only subsequently that the Kaizak were named by the Russians Kirghis-Kaizak, and that the Kirghis of Yenisei, after their migration southwards before the Russian advance, became known as the Burut-Kirghis and the Kara-Kirghis.

Fourth Period. The fourth and last epoch in the history of the Turks in Central Asia begins with the Russian conquest of a more regular character than the exploits of the Volga Cossacks. In the north it began with the foundation of Tomsk (1604) on land wrung from the Kuchum Khanate, and it ended in 1647 with the foundation of Okhotsk on the Pacific. In the south the first milestone of the Russian advance was the destruction of the Khanate of Kazan in 1552; the Khanate of Astrakhan shared its fate in 1556. For a moment the Russian success was checked by the rising of the Yaik Cossacks, to whose efforts the previous advance was largely due. After the suppression of their rising these Cossacks, renamed the Ural Cossacks, again became a Russian weapon, moving against the Kaizak and the Turkic tribes of the steppes. Although the Kaizak were nominally subjugated in 1734 they were not really conquered until Russia became master of Turkestan, and there was a great rising against Russia in 1840, when Kenissari, the Sultan of the Great Orda, made another attempt to unite the Kaizak into one great independent nation. In 1864 the Russians succeeded in encircling the Kaizak territories with a line of military defences, thus cutting them

[1] See M. A. Czaplicka, 'The Evolution of the Cossack Communities', *J. Centr. As. S.*, May, 1918.

3: Czaplicka E-4 (no date) 1918 RL4 Turkic Peoples RL4

off from the other Central Asiatic powers, just as in the eighteenth century they succeeded in encircling the Finno-Turkic nation of the Bashkir between the Volga and the Urals.

The first Turkic intellectual centre to fall into Russian hands was Tashkent in 1865, and three years later the capital of the Iranian Turks, Samarkand (known to the Greeks as Marakanda, and captured by Alexander the Great in the fourth century B.C.), lost its independence. This decided the fate of Bokhara, which became a dependent state, and a little later, in 1875, Khiva succumbed also. The Khanate of Kokand, conquered in 1875, was renamed the Ferghana Territory. The next tribe to be subdued was the Turkomans, whose courageous and obstinate defence was broken by the fall of Gheok-Tepe in 1881. In 1895 the eastern boundary of Russian territory was fixed at the Pamir.

The Central Asiatic territories were never colonized to the same extent as Siberia, or even the Caspian Steppe country; they might be called dependencies rather than colonies. Economically during the last two decades these provinces have begun to increase their output of cotton, fruit, and other local products, but intellectually the Iranian Turks have vegetated in the antiquated remnants of the Arabo-Persian civilizations, influenced gradually by the slow, heavy progress of Russian culture. The Turanian Turks, in much greater political subjection than the Iranian, and economically entirely dependent on Russian colonization, have kept their primitive culture from spurious elements, either Arabo-Persian or Chinese, but they are, of all the Turks, the most amenable to the influence of Russian peasant life.

A 175 273 Marco Polo also describes wines made of dates or of sugar and dates, sugar, rice, grain, and grapes. (36) Again distillation and spirits are not mentioned.

36. 1908, 91, 104, 280f., 476, 500.

A 176 272 [273] Carpini reports of the Tatars: "If they have horse milk, they drink it in enormous quantities, also the milk of sheep, goats, and camels. They do not have wine, beer, and mead unless these beverages happen to be imported from other nations or sent as presents. Because they do not have horse milk in winter, unless they are wealthy, they boil millet with water and make such a thin broth of it that one cannot eat it but must drink it...In summer, however, when they A [262] have enough horse milk, they seldom eat meat unless they just happen to /74/ be presented with some or kill game or a bird on the hunt." A [273] (37) Carpini explicitly says that spirits are not known; however, he

37. Johann de Plano Carpini, 1930, 101.

does not mention kumiss either.

Tu 273 175 Ibn Batuta reports: "The chief beverage of the Turks is wine made from honey." The same is reported by Chinese travelers of the 13th century A D. (38)

38. W. W. Rockhill, 1900, 62, footnote 1.

All informants mention the ordinary kumiss and other alcoholic beverages but not spirits, and they do not know the word Arrack. Therefore, the distillation process must have been unknown there; otherwise they would probably have described it.

4. Arrack and Distillation

Tu Ti [114 176] 273 It is often maintained that the preparation of milk schnapps, distillation, came to the nomads of Inner Asia through the Tibetans. Inasmuch as the Tibetan nomads do not know kumiss, much less distilled kumiss, and do not make distilled schnapps from grain, they cannot have introduced the process. Others believe that distillation was brought to the nomads through Chinese or European influence. (39)

39. Ebert, Reallexikon, Volume XI, 40.